FILED

LEE CRAFT - CASE NO. 17-1544

AUG 1 0 2017

## DEBORAH'S. HUNT, Clerk NITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH

LEE CRAFT

Case No. 17-1544

v.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Board Case No. 26-CA-085613

#### APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF

#### REPLY TO THE BOARD'S FINDINGS OF FACT

I object to the categorization of several of the allegations against me. Some of allegations against me are written as fact (e.g., "In addition, Craft made numerous comments to Coleman about her clothes, including remarks about her underwear." While others are more appropriately preceded by language that indicates that these are allegations and not fact.

#### REPLY TO ARGUMENT

I assert that the Board's dismissal of my complaint was not rational or supported by substantial evidence and that both the Board and the administrative law judge gave undue credit to the respondent's witnesses and failed to grant me restitution based on the reasoning given for my wrongful termination.

LEE CRAFT - CASE NO. 17-1544

I deny that there "would have been" legitimate reasons for my discharge even if I had not engaged in protective activity. I categorically deny that I engaged in harassing and intimidating behaviors toward any other employees at Philips. I feel that it is noteworthy that none of the "other employees" who witnesses any "out of control" behaviors and "harassment" were produced at the trial other than the people who I cited in my complaints to human resources. None of the other witnesses ever attributed such negative descriptions to my character or conduct. I further assert that it was impossible for me to perform certain duties as a lead employee without the support of management.

As to the allegations of poor work performance, if I, in my capacity and role as a lead, instruct an employee to perform a task, and they do not complete the task but instead go to the supervisor to claim harassment, not only will I not be successful in my position, but it puts my reputation and my family's livelihood at risk. This is precisely why I attempted to obtain some kind of help from corporate Human Resources as evidenced by my many email exhibits in the original trial documents. The decision to terminate me was nothing short of malicious and I overheard Kim Coleman state that she was purposefully attempting to get me fired by stating that I was harassing her.

LEE CRAFT - CASE NO. 17-1544

Finally, I deny that my claims are without merit. I deny that I engaged in any type of misconduct pertaining to my coworkers or management. The judge erred in crediting the testimony of Sherry McMurrian, Thelma Halbert, and Kim Coleman. These three are the subject of my requests for assistance from corporate Human Resource, along with Rolita Turner. Sherry McMurrian, herself, committed perjury by stating that there was no unwritten rule in spite of evidence provided in the contrary. Additionally, none of the witnesses (with the exceptions of the ones mentioned above) had anything remotely negative to say about my conduct. Allegations of insubordination ("failure to stay out of the Ballast Department" was also untenable as (for example) the record and map of the facility indicate that it would have been impossible for me to perform my work duties and stay out of the area altogether. Taking these things into consideration, I assert that it was not a rational decision for the Board to uphold the judge's decision to credit McMurrian, Coleman, and Halbert.

#### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I believe the Board erred in upholding the administrative judge's decision because I was in fact wrongfully terminated for engaging in protected activities. To say that I "would have" been terminated anyway because of other alleged issues is not relevant. The

LEE CRAFT - CASE NO. 17-1544

reason for my termination was clearly stated. I was terminated for showing my write up and telling my coworkers what happened. This is a protected activity. The Board found that Philips maintained an unlawful rule and the application of this rule was the basis for my termination. These are the facts. If the law has any meaning, the Board should have held Philips accountable and awarded damages.

I certify that a copy of this Appellant's Reply Brief was sent to opposing counsel			
via U.S. Mail on the	day of	, 2017.	

### A COPY OF THE REPLY BRIEF WAS SUBMITTED TO THE FOLLOWING PARTIES BY

FEDERAL EXPRESS ON <u>08-09-</u>(7

RECEIVED

DESCRAH'S. HUNT, Clerk

Jill Colyer

**US Court Of Appeals** 

100 E. Fifth Street

Room 540 Cincinnati OH 45202

(513) 564-7000

William T. Hearne

National Labor Relations Board, Region 26

80 Monroe Avenue, Suite 350

Memphis Tennessee 38103

(901) 425-7232

**Sherry McMurrian** 

**Philips Electronics North** 

**America Corporation** 

3399 E. Raines

Memphis TN 38118-6819

(901) 795-1071

Mason Miller, ESQ

Senior Counsel, Employment & Labor Law

Philips Electronics North America Corporation

200 Franklin Square Drive

Somerset, New Jersey 08873-4186

(732) 563-3123



earthsmart
FedEx carbon-neutral
envelope shipping



Case: 17-1544 Filed: 08/10/2017 Document: 14 Page: 7



## Extremely Urgent

# For FedEx Express® Shipments Only

Contents should be compatible with the container and packed securely. For shipping terms and conditions and our limits of liability, refer to the applicable FadEx Express shipping document, the current FadEx Service Guide, or conditions of carriage.

© 2013 FedEx 155475/155476 REV 9/13

For more information on FedEx Express services, solutions, and shipping locations, go to fedex.com, or contact your nearest FedEx location.